

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 13, 2004 (Paper No. 39). Claims 80 to 93 are in the application, of which Claims 80, 86 to 88, 92 and 93 are independent. Claims 80, 86 to 88, 92 and 93 are being amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 80 to 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs.

Initially, Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the September 7, 2004 interview. During the interview, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraph rejections of Claims 80 to 87 were discussed, and it was agreed that the rejections would be overcome by amending Claims 80, 86 and 87 as presented herein. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 80 to 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,111,659 (Murata) and U.S. Patent No. 5,862,297 (Timmermans), and Claims 88 to 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Murata and U.S. Patent No. 6,243,171 (Haneda). Reconsideration withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 80 defines an image reproduction control apparatus comprising an accessing unit, a reading section, and a reproduction control section. The accessing unit accesses a recording medium storing a plurality of reproducible images and a reproduction instruction file containing a plurality of file names specifying images to be reproduced, the reproduction instruction file being separate from the plurality of images. The reading section reads the reproduction instruction file stored in the recording medium. The

reproduction control section controls reproduction of the reproducible images by reading the images specified by the reproduction instruction file read by said reading section. If a particular image specified by the reproduction instruction file to be reproduced is not recorded in the recording medium, reproduction is not performed for the particular image and identification information indicating absence of the particular image is stored in a memory, and if a next reproducible image is specified by the reproduction instruction file and said reproduction control section determines that the next reproducible image is recorded in the recording medium, the next reproducible image is reproduced.

The applied art, namely Murata and Timmermans, is not seen to show each and every feature of Claim 80, particularly as regards an image specified by a reproduction instruction file but not recorded in a recording medium. More particularly, Murata and Timmermans are not seen to show not performing reproduction for such an image and storing identification information indicating absence of the image.

It is believed that the Office Action concedes that Murata fails to show these features. In addition, during the September 7, 2004 interview, it was agreed that the disclosure of Timmermans cited by the Office Action does not teach these features. Accordingly, it is believed that Claim 80 is in condition for allowance. In addition, it is believed that Claims 86 and 87, which are method and computer-readable storage medium claims corresponding to Claim 80, are believed to be in condition for allowance for the same reasons.

Turning to Claim 88, a recording control apparatus is defined for controlling recording of images in a recording medium. The apparatus includes a recording medium

accessing unit that can access the recording medium, the recording medium storing a plurality of reproducible images and a reproduction instruction file containing instruction information including a plurality of file names specifying images to be reproduced, the reproduction instruction file being separate from the plurality of images. The apparatus comprises an indication section and a control section. The indication section indicates deletion of an image in accordance with a manual operation whether the indicated image is instructed to be reproduced by the reproduction instruction file or not. The control section deletes the instruction information in the reproduction instruction file corresponding to the image indicated by the indication section to be deleted if the instruction information corresponding to the image is stored in the reproduction instruction file, and retains the instruction information corresponding to images that have not been indicated for deletion. The recording medium accessing unit accesses the recording medium in accordance with a manual operation, the recording medium being accessed so as to specify an image to be reproduced.

The applied art, namely Murata and Haneda, is not seen to show each and every one of the above-recited features, particularly as regards a control section that deletes instruction information stored in a reproduction instruction file corresponding to an image indicated by an indication section to be deleted, and that retains the instruction information corresponding to images that have not been indicated for deletion.

Murata is seen to describe a digital copying machine with a card reader to read a card storing image data and control data. (See Murata, col. 3, lines 12 to 44) Reference is respectfully made to Murata commencing at col. 9, line 1, wherein it is seen to

describe that the command file storing the control data is deleted when “all printing as specified in the print job command file is completed”. Thus, Murata is seen to delete a command file once the control information has been used to perform the printing. Murata is not seen to show a control section that deletes instruction information stored in a reproduction instruction file corresponding to an image indicated by an indication section to be deleted, and that retains the instruction information corresponding to images that have not been indicated for deletion.

The portion of Haneda has been carefully reviewed and is not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted above with respect to Murata.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 88 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicant submits that Claims 92 and 93, which are method and computer-readable storage medium claims corresponding to Claim 88, are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The other claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant  
Carole A. Quinn  
Registration No.: 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 86236v1